

THE SCOTTISH REFORMED CHURCH AND ENGLISH PURITANISM

BY THE REV. J. L. AINSLIE, B.D., PH.D.

It may be necessary to state at the outset what is here to be understood by the terms "The Scottish Reformed Church" and "English Puritanism." With the former name the Church of Scotland is not to be thought of simply as Protestant. It could be called that, one may suppose, when it was organised prelatically. Here, however, by the designation "Reformed" is meant the Church of Scotland, as having the theology (Calvinistic), practice, customs, manner of Public Worship of, and organised more or less in accordance with, Presbyterian Order, after the style of the other Protestant Churches which, then as now, were called "Reformed" in distinction from the Lutheran and Anglican Churches. Under the designation "English Puritanism" we purpose to consider an ecclesiastical, theological and religious movement and party in England which arose at the Reformation and continued through the second half of the 16th century, the whole of the 17th century, till at the beginning of the 18th century it developed into the Low Church Party within the Church of England, but much more into the main bodies of what came to be called English Dissent or Nonconformity. Its period corresponded very closely with that in Scotland from the early stirrings of the Reformation until after the Revolution Settlement when the National Church, having become "stablished, strengthened, settled," in the form much as we now have it, was moving on into the 18th century.

The Puritan Party in England, to state the matter briefly, stood for much fuller reform in the Church of England, of a like kind to that of what its members were in the habit of calling "the best reformed Churches," which meant in accordance with the Swiss, French, and Netherlands Protestant Churches and their like on the Continent. Its aim was to do away with all superstitious Mediaeval customs and ceremonies, which, in spite of a considerable measure of reform, still found place in the English Church, and instead to have as far as possible a thoroughly Scriptural Church in organisation, worship, belief, and general Christian piety. In its beginnings this party was wholly within the National Church, and in the main continued to be so, although in course of time there was a growing number of Separatists. After the Restoration, by the Act of Uniformity, on the fateful St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662, Puritanism as a distinct party was driven out of the Established Church.

One would like to enlarge on the manner of life and character of the English Puritans. Our limits will not permit. One can only say that, speaking generally, they formed the great majority of the most earnest and intelligent of the churchmen and laity. London and the more advanced parts of the country were always strongholds of Puritanism. Parliament also, over and over again, showed its leanings towards the same, and was only prevented from favouring it by strong royal opposition. Puritanism produced a very fine type of piety, and in an age when the average levels of morality and religion were lower than we are usually inclined to think, it stood for purer morals and less worldly religion. It led men to suffer the spoiling of their goods rather than desert their ideals and nerved them to endure abominable bodily sufferings in prisons, and, if need be, martyrdom, in being true to their visions of a reformed and purified Church and people.

In view of animadversions against the English Puritans by a number of writers, it becomes advisable to point out that those who were the most properly called by the name of Puritan are not to be confused with the various fantastic and strange sects which largely resulted from the unbalanced use of the Scriptures by illiterate or disorderly men who drew after themselves certain more or less numerous followers. Those originally called Puritans were the Presbyterian party within the Church of England. Even the Independents at first applied the name specially to Presbyterians. The latter objected to it as a designation for themselves. Later it has become an honourable name, especially in America. In this essay it is used to include the more normal Independents and Baptists as well as the Presbyterians.

Our specific purpose is to notice and examine the interaction between the Scottish Reformed Church and the English Puritans as now defined. Accordingly we propose to consider questions as to what the Scottish Church and the Puritans gave to each other, and also how they affected each other in various ways.

Before entering on this enquiry it will be interesting to remember that England received specially strong impetus from Continental Protestantism in the earlier period of its Reformation movement, by the residence in the country of certain foreign reformers, Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, Bernardino Ochino, and others, and by the settling in London of a foreign congregation under John A'Lasco, and another at Glastonbury under Vallerand Pullain. The Protestantism of all these was of the Reformed and Presbyterian type, and no doubt they would have a considerable influence upon those who were desiring a thorough Reformation in England. By their teaching, and with regard to the foreign congregations, by practical demonstration, these foreigners contributed to the formation of Presbyterian Puritanism within the English Church. They helped to stamp its character from the beginning.

I

In the interaction of the Scottish Reformed Church and English Puritanism we may conveniently think of certain phases of contact. The first is that brought about by the residence of John Knox in England during the reign of Edward VI from April 1549 to March 1553. At that time about 80 preachers were officially appointed to go about the country to instruct the people in the Protestant doctrines. Knox was one of those chosen for this work. But he was not the only Scottish reformer so appointed. There were also John Rough, John MacBriar, and John Willock. Knox, however, was the most eminent. Later he seems to have been made one of the King's chaplains. Thus he had ample opportunity of exerting considerable influence upon Church and people in England.

It may seem somewhat of an anachronism to speak of the Scottish Reformed Church as having an influence anywhere at the time of Knox' sojourn in England. It had as yet not become organised. It was not to be formally constituted until 1560. Yet we may fairly think of it as a Reformed Church in the making. Knox too had ere this been one of the main promoters of the coming Church, and was to be much more so. Thus he may well be considered as representative of it while in England, and moreover representative of it as a Reformed Church. He himself was already of the Reformed persuasion, though as yet he had not had his course at Geneva. The late Dr. Charles Martin of Geneva says of him at this time: "When Knox arrived in England in 1549, he was imbued with doctrines most distinctly Reformed, which he had borrowed, I am persuaded, from the tradition still living of Wicliffe and the Lollards, rather than from the teaching of the Reformers of Geneva or Switzerland."¹ Martin does not give his reasons for this opinion. Dr. Peter Lorimer in his *John Knox and the Church of England* says that when Knox began his ministry in England "he was already a Protestant of what afterwards came to be called the Puritan type, but what at that early date would have been described as Protestantism of the Zwinglian or Helvetic, as distinguished from the Lutheran or Saxon type."² Lorimer does give his reasons for this opinion which seem to be quite sound. So we may suitably think of the Scottish Church as both Protestant and Reformed by one so representative of it as John Knox, bringing its influence to bear upon the rising Puritanism of England.

The first engagement of Knox was as preacher in Berwick-on-Tweed. He was stationed there for about two years. It looks as if he had been placed in control of the services in the parish church, which sets one wondering what had become of the vicar. As a matter of fact he seems

¹ *Les Prot. Anglais*, etc., p. 6.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

to have been non-resident and to have paid a "curate" to fulfil the duties of the parish. Both he and the curate appear to have been remarkably ignorant, the former rather more so than the latter. It is reported that it was doubtful whether he could say "his Paternoster truly either in Latin or in English." The ministrations of Knox would be a great change from the mere performance of offices in a slovenly manner by an ignorant priest. For the services of the church Knox drew up and used a simple liturgy. It seems that the First Prayer Book of Edward VI had not so far been introduced into the North of England, and the Second, of course, had not yet been published. So Knox was free to use his own. His ministry in Berwick had very marked results. There was a manifest reformation of the morals and religious life both of the soldiers and the civilians. Possibly there was begun a Puritan tradition in the town, for Berwick seems to have continued to have leanings that way, till now long afterwards there has set in the religious carelessness of the 20th century. At any rate, in the century following Knox's stay in the place, when a new Parish Church had to be built, Berwick seems to have had Puritan tastes in architecture. The new building had no tower or spire, no belfry and no bell, and, what would have been anathema to Laud, it had lofts or galleries. It was a plain, yet quite tasteful building both within and without. The galleries have been taken down in comparatively recent times. But the worshippers are still summoned to this church as well as to the other churches of the town by chimes from the belfry of the Town Hall. The first minister of the new 17th century Church was a Puritan Presbyterian vicar. He was a man of learning and piety, and having the warm regard of his people. After the Restoration he was deprived of his charge by the authorities even before St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662.

To go back to Knox, we look at his ministry in Newcastle-on-Tyne to which place he was sent after being at Berwick. He had preached there previously. It had been on the occasion when he was called to vindicate his teaching that the Mass was idolatry. His sermon was delivered in the fine church of St. Nicholas before a congregation which crowded the large building. Among those present were the Bishop of Durham and his Canons all of whom were hostile to Knox. He was settled in Newcastle for a period of one year to two years. From the pulpit of St. Nicholas' Church he had the opportunity of exerting a wide influence. The opposition of the Bishop and his clergy only served to advertise him. The Council of the North sometimes met in Newcastle, and its members joined the congregation gathering in the great church when Knox was preaching. Lorimer tells us that opposition served to draw "around him in the Church of St. Nicholas a congregation including much of the wealth and station and intelligence of the two chief towns of Durham

and Northumberland.”¹ We may be sure that Knox would make the most of his opportunity. The effects of his ministry in Newcastle could hardly fail to have lasting results. It is interesting to notice that later, in 1588, the people of the town chose John Udall, an eminent Puritan, to be their preacher. Much later still, in the days of the Westminster Assembly, Robert Baillie and George Gillespie had the opportunity of preaching in St. Nicholas’ Church. Newcastle perhaps never quite lost a savour of Puritanism. Unhappily, in the disintegrations of the 18th century, it seems clear that a large proportion of the people had sunk very low. John Wesley found it so. But a Puritan conscience to some extent still remained, which only needed stirring by the preaching of Wesley, himself standing in a direct Puritan succession, to bring about a remarkable religious awakening. One writer says, “Wesley had never received such a welcome as he found in the metropolis of the North.” In later times, until recently when there has been again a certain decay of the religious life of the people, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches have flourished in Newcastle. It may be of interest to add that the interior of the fine old church, with which Knox had so close a connection for a short time, preserved a simple and sober aspect until recent times. It had little in the way of mediaeval furnishings beyond what a Pre-reformation church usually shows when purged, as would have been said by the Puritans, of its idolatry. It was made the cathedral church of the new diocese of Newcastle about sixty years ago. Only within the last quarter of a century have noticeable changes been made in its furnishings the chief of which has been the setting up of a large crucifix on a rood-screen under the chancel arch.

When Knox arrived in England the Vestments Controversy was just beginning. The question was as to whether or not it was right for ministers officiating at Public Worship, especially at the Communion, to wear the various vestments which had been the rule for the priests of the Roman Church. A matter of this kind may seem to some of us of small importance, and not of sufficient consequence to raise a serious controversy. The advocates of the wearing of the vestments did try to persuade their opponents that it was a matter of indifference, yet they never treated it as such for themselves, and would not yield in the least to proposals that a minister should be free to wear the vestments or not according to the dictates of his conscience. In reality the controversy was concerned with what was of much greater importance than some have supposed. The vestments certainly were the badges of the Roman rites. Thomas Platter, a Swiss student touring England in 1599, describes his attendance at a service in London: “On the morning of Septr. 21st I went to St.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

Paul's Church, where I saw and heard the canons, in white surplices and square birettas, similar to the Papists at home, conduct the service in English, with music and organ accompaniment, just as if they were celebrating Mass." We have records of similar observations by other foreign tourists of the time. There was, indeed, too much resemblance to the old mediaeval superstitious ceremonial. Naturally the vestments were an offence to the thorough reformers, and might be a snare to the ignorant and half-reformed of the people. It was to be expected that the Puritans would advocate their disuse. They were afraid of their effects in the Church. Time has shown their fears to have been justified. The mediaeval vestments and other like accompaniments used in the public worship of the Church of England have furthered the conceptions in that Church that it possesses the mediaeval priesthood and the mediaeval Mass.

Knox sympathised with the opponents of the use of vestments. In his *Vindication* in 1550, he scornfully speaks of the "habits," as the vestments were called. Yet he does not appear to have been quite so strongly opposed to them as were some of the Puritans, and he advised them not to be too rigid in the matter. This advice did not please many of them.

Knox seems to have been stronger in his opposition to the practice of kneeling at the Communion. He strove hard to have it altered to sitting, but without success. All that he effected was to have inserted at the end of the Communion Service an explanatory rubric that no adoration of the elements was intended. It has been called the "Black Rubric." It was removed from the Prayer Book in the reign of Elizabeth, but, strange to say, was reinserted after the Restoration of Charles II. It has been a thorn in the side of the Anglo-Catholics ever since, but a support to the Evangelicals in the Church of England. Here then is one lasting result of the efforts of Knox on the side of the English Puritans.

The influence of Knox is also seen in another direction. He appears to have been quite dissatisfied with the hierarchical constitution, as he then saw it, of the English Church. When offered the bishopric of Rochester he declined it. Some English Puritans who very likely held similar views were confirmed in their opinions by his attitude, for later others also refused bishoprics. Influences from various other sources were working to move English Puritans to favour the abolition of the hierarchy. Thus they came to adopt an ideal of a Presbyterian organisation for their Church and strove to realise it.

Although it does not belong to this phase of interaction due to Knox's residence in England, it will be convenient to notice a little more of his influence upon the Puritanism of England. After fleeing from the country at the beginning of Mary Tudor's reign, he never again had the opportunity

of engaging in person in the work of the Reformation in that country. But he never lost his great interest in the affairs of religion there. He made efforts once and again to further the cause of the thorough-going reformers. We can only notice one of these. After the death of the persecuting Queen, and before he left Geneva, Knox wrote *A Brief Exhortation to England, for the Speedy Embracing of Christ's Gospel* (1558). In it he says: "Ye must at once so purge and expel all dregs of Papistry, superstition, and idolatry. . . . The glittering beauty of vain ceremonies, the heaps of things pertaining nothing to edification . . . ought at once to be removed, and so trodden under the obedience of God's Word." Probably the generalities of this exhortation did not satisfy those strongly opposed to the use of vestments. They would rather have had a quite explicit declaration by Knox against surplices, copes, albs, and the rest. Knox also in the *E*hortation* presented to the Puritans a programme of reform in the Church. Thus we see Knox continuing to exert himself on behalf of full reform in England. Lorimer says that Thomas Carlyle calls Knox the father of English Puritanism. Carlyle must have been exaggerating a little. Lorimer himself states that what Knox outlined in the above programme was largely adopted by the English Puritans. This is hardly correct. Some of the items they had already more or less adopted. For others they were indebted to their returning exiles. With one of the items they were clearly not impressed, viz., the brief suggestions regarding church organisation, which appear to have a little resemblance to Knox's own later arrangements for superintendents in Scotland. The Elizabethan Puritans never accepted an arrangement of that kind. Their plans were for an ordinary and simple Presbyterian system. Yet when all has been said by way of modifying exaggerated claims for Knox's influence in England, it must be acknowledged that he did exert an immense force in the furtherance and promotion of the Puritan cause in England.

II

We come now to another phase of interaction. It is different from the one which we have been considering. Its first movements were neither in England nor in Scotland, but among the Marian exiles from England on the Continent. Knox and other Scots Protestants were among them, though, of course, the various parties of refugees were practically made up of English folk. A large proportion of them were Puritans. The most important gathering came to be at Geneva where an English congregation was organised. Among the members of it were learned men with good literary qualifications who prepared works which came to be of the greatest importance to the Churches of Scotland and England. They produced for the use of their Genevan church a collection

of Metrical Psalms and a Service Book. Before the sojourn of all of them in Geneva had come to an end, they also sent forth a new translation of the Scriptures commonly known as the Geneva Bible.

We can only notice particularly the Service Book. After the constituting of the Reformed Church of Scotland in 1560, the Genevan Service Book, which came to be called in Scotland "Knox's Liturgy" or *The Book of Common Order* was, by the General Assemblies of 1562 and 1564, definitely adopted and authorised for use in the Church. It must be borne in mind that it was not enforced upon the Scottish Church to be rigidly adhered to and uniformly followed as was the case with the *Book of Common Prayer* upon the Church of England. It was not provided as an invariable Prayer Book for ministers and people. It had much that was permissive in its use as several of the rubrics go to show. It had the character of a "Directory" for public worship and other Church ordinances, and was set up, we may gather, as an authoritative guide and compendium of prayers for the use of the ministers and courts of the Church. Such a book was very much needed at this time. There was all the confusion and irregularity unavoidable during a period of violent transition. The ordinances and forms of worship in the Church had to be regularised. This we may conclude was effected by the *Book of Common Order*. To what extent in all its entirety it was actually used throughout the land, or how long it was in constant use, are questions which it would be very difficult to answer precisely. These will be brought up and briefly considered later. This, however, we may accept with assurance, that this Service Book was formative of the customary style of worship for the Church and people of Scotland. So strongly were customary usages, due to it grounded in the Church and the hearts of the people, that in spite of changes in Church government and arbitrary attempts of kings and prelates to bring in other ritual, they continued much the same until they received fresh sanctions from the Westminster Directory.

It is interesting to note that in England also the Genevan Service Book had a fugitive use. Sometimes, as unobtrusively as possible so as not to attract public notice, it was followed in the services of Puritan congregations, in preference to the *Book of Common Prayer* which was considered to have objectionable features. Further we may notice that, in the early Presbyterian "Directory," which was due to Travers and Cartwright, the order of Public Worship set forth therein is practically that of the Genevan Book.

III

During the reigns of Elizabeth and her successor James there is not

much to notice of that interaction we are considering. Some Scots found a sphere for the exercise of their ministry within the Church of England. It would hardly be possible to know how many they were. Probably for the most part they were on the Puritan side. We hear of a gathering of ministers in London at the house of the well-known Puritan, John Field. Some Scots had joined the company. Brook gives us an account of the affair: "In 1584 we find him [John Field] brought into other troubles, when he was suspended by the Bishop of London. The cause of his suspension was, his admitting an assembly of ministers in his house, among whom were several Scotch divines. These divines being disaffected to the hierarchy, the assembly was declared to be an unlawful conventicle. Mr. Field was, therefore, suspended from his ministry, for entertaining them, and the rest were deprived for refusing subscription." One may wonder whether these Scots divines were in office in the Church of England, and if Brook means that they were deprived of their positions like the rest. At any rate we learn this much, that some Scottish ministers were in sympathy and touch with advanced Puritans.

Most important for consideration, however, in weighing up the extent of the religious interaction of this period between Scotland and England, is the establishing in Scotland of a Church Reformed and Presbyterian. That became an accomplished fact for a while. It served greatly to confirm and instruct English Puritans in their Presbyterianism.

IV

In the period beginning with the resistance in the Scottish Church to the ecclesiastical schemes of Charles I, in which he was assisted by Archbishop Laud, which includes the Civil War and the Westminster Assembly, and ends with the overthrow of the Commonwealth, we have presented to us the most extensive and vigorous of the phases of interaction between the Scottish Reformed Church and English Puritanism. The rule of Cromwell over Scotland comes within this period, but it will be better to regard it as a separate phase of interaction and to consider it independently later on.

The uprising of the Scottish church-folk against the designs of Charles with regard to public worship was watched with great interest and sympathy by many in England. There were stirrings amongst politicians and Puritan churchmen against arbitrary rule in Church and State. Charles was eager to suppress by force the rising against his church authority in Scotland. He was unable to do so because he could not obtain the necessary support in England for Puritanism was beginning to have political weight. Consequently he was obliged to allow Scotland

to have its meetings of the General Assembly. The invasion of England by the Covenanting Scottish army in 1640 led to the calling of the Long Parliament in England. Charles was now no longer to be unquestioned master in either England or Scotland. We can notice here religious and political interaction between the two countries actively at work.

While the negotiations between Charles and the Scottish Commissioners for a settlement in connection with the presence of the Scottish army in England were proceeding, larger projects came into view. The Scots Commissioners were in London and were brought constantly into touch with Puritans. The idea of a possible uniformity of the Churches of the two countries in doctrine, government, and worship took hold of them. It was perhaps also at the same time taking hold of a number of the English Puritans. As for the Scots, we can see how it had entered into the mind of Alexander Henderson. Baillie relates that at the General Assembly which met in July 1641, "The Moderator [Henderson] fell on a notable motion, of drawing up a Confession of Faith, a Catechism, a Directory for all the parts of Public Worship, and platform of government, wherein possibly England and we might agree."

Events move on. The Civil War in England began in 1642. On July 1st, 1643, the Westminster Assembly opened its sittings. In the war, affairs did not go so well with the Parliamentarians. They moved for an alliance with Scotland. They would have preferred a political alliance, but the Scots would not agree to anything but a religious Covenant. The Solemn League and Covenant had been drafted in Scotland. With some demur this Covenant was accepted by the English Parliamentary Party as the basis of the alliance. It was first signed in Scotland and a little later by the members of the English Parliament and those of the Westminster Assembly. The determination to bring about uniformity of a Reformed Church order in the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland was put in the very first section of the Covenant. The Westminster Assembly was directed to prepare the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Directory for Public Worship, and the Form of Church Government, with which the uniformity would be realised. Commissioners from the Church of Scotland were appointed to take part with the Assembly in the carrying out of this great undertaking. Thus this ambitious project of making the ecclesiastical organisations of the British Isles uniformly of the Reformed type was launched.

To those who are familiar with the ecclesiastical conditions of England in modern times there may be amazement that any sensible man in the Church of Scotland could for a moment entertain such a wildly ambitious scheme. If one knows the times, the scheme will not appear so amazing. It must be remembered that the England of those days was not the England of the 19th and 20th centuries. In these later times it has a

very large and heterogeneous population. But in the 17th century the population was comparatively small and homogeneous. It was made up of ancestrally native English folk in town and country. The Roman Church had only the political power which the Queen, and with her the king and the courtiers, could give it ; which power was very jealously watched. The Laudian Anglo-Catholicism in the Church of England was opposed within the Church itself by a body, numerous, if not quite so powerful as the other, composed of evangelical Puritans and Calvinists. This has to be borne in mind that the great mass of the real Puritanism was distinctly within the Church as it had been in the days of Queen Elizabeth.

Peterkin has incidentally expressed some indignation at what he considers the unwarrantable and unjustifiable intrusion of the Scottish Churchmen into the internal affairs of England, and at their efforts for the destruction, as he describes it, of the Church of England. But Peterkin must have closed his mind against facts which he knew. The leaders of the Scottish Church did not move in this great enterprise of bringing the English Church into uniformity with the Reformed Churches without being invited to do so. Both the English Parliament and the Puritan ministers asked for their help and appealed to them to espouse their cause. Peterkin himself gives some of the correspondence between the Scots and the English, which reveals this, and there would be much more than what these letters show. That Peterkin censures the Scottish Churchmen as making efforts for the destruction of the Church of England shows that he has totally misunderstood the historic conditions and circumstances. In accordance with their own convictions regarding the *jus divinum* of Presbytery, it was not destruction, but a Scriptural reform and a reconstruction according to the divine Scriptural pattern which the Scots churchmen were striving after for the Church of England. In their minds there was no more thought of destroying the Church of England than there had been of destroying their own Church of Scotland by their proceedings in the Glasgow Assembly of 1638. Moreover, had such been their intention they would have met with nothing but strong opposition from the Puritans within the Church. But these Puritans, not only because they had been groaning and suffering under the intolerance and persecution of the cruel Laudian hierarchy, but also because to some extent they were the heirs of those who for generations had likewise held by the *jus divinum* of Presbytery, were longing for reforms which would not only bring deliverance from tyranny, but would definitely provide a more Scriptural constitution of the Church. Above all, there was to the Scottish Churchmen and English Puritans alike the dream of a fuller unity of the Churches of the British Isles through a uniformity in faith and order. In setting the realisation of this before

them they were but following Charles I and Laud, who had previously been striving hard to bring about a uniformity of the Churches of Britain, not of the same kind indeed, but one along the lines of English Episcopacy.

For the purpose of providing what was necessary to secure the much desired uniformity, the Westminster Assembly carried on its earnest deliberations from 1643 to 1649. In this Assembly the Scottish Commissioners had an honourable place. They were looked to for information and guidance. There was very much need of instruction for both ministers and people in the ways and working of a Reformed Church, and the Scottish Commissioners were considered well able to provide it on account of their experience in Scotland of the organisation and administration of a national Church of the Presbyterian Order. They were given many opportunities of lecturing and preaching to the general public, and sometimes also to the Parliament. In the Assembly they exercised an influence far beyond their small number. They were questioned and consulted and often helped to settle debates and to lead the Assembly through confused arguments to a clear position. In some of the committees, as the numbers were small, and they were all included, they were almost equal in number to the English divines. All this has not to be lost sight of in estimating to whom the credit is due in the framing of the valuable documents of the Westminster Assembly.

The utmost that the Scottish Commissioners could do was needed for bringing about the Reformed Church uniformity which they had set before them. When Baillie was in London in 1640-1641, in connection with the negotiations of the Treaty with the King, he had thought that there was a very great body of Presbyterians in Church and State. He wrote: "The far greatest part are for our discipline." Later he had reason to change his estimate and to agree to "the impossibility ever to have gotten England reformed . . . without their brethren's help." The situation at first seems to have been that in the Church, although the Puritans were numerous, the definite Presbyterianism of the Elizabethan Puritans was only to be found among some of them; the others had not become quite clear in their minds about full Reformed Church order. As for Parliament, Neal¹ says that at first most of the members were inclined for a reformed and moderate episcopacy. It must have been largely due to the instruction and influence of the Scottish Commissioners, joined with the efforts of those ministers of the Church of England who were definitely of the Presbyterian Party, that in spite of the opposition of the Independents and others in the Assembly and in Parliament, in course of time the majority of the Parliament and those having to do

¹ *History of the Puritans*, Vol. III, 6.

with the Church were led on to favour, or at least agree to, the establishing of the Church according to the Presbyterian Order.

The Westminster Assembly had finished its main tasks before the beginning of 1649. It had drawn up and put forth the Directory for Public Worship, the Form of Presbyterial Church Government, the Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. These were all given authority by the English Parliament, except for certain reservations. Their position in England was short-lived. With the Restoration they were swept from all place in the Established Church. To this day the majority in the Church of England are probably unaware of their ever having existed.

The Westminster Documents, as they were issued, were all put before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and were approved and adopted. It may be mentioned here that the Westminster Assembly had sanctioned the use of a new Metrical Psalter prepared by Francis Rous. This was submitted to the Scottish Assembly. After drastic revision, making it almost a different version, it was sent forth as the authorised Psalter of the Church, which it has continued to be up to the present.

At the Revolution Settlement, when the measures were carried through by the Government to establish the Church of Scotland once more as a Church of the Reformed Order, of the Westminster Documents the only one which finds a place in the Act is the Confession of Faith. It ought not to be concluded, however, that at this time the other documents were done away with in the Church. They had been adopted by Acts of Assembly which had never been repealed by the Church. It is true that the Governments after the Restoration had decreed them to be annulled, but it would be rank Erastianism to consider that such legislation had any validity for the Church. Happily the Church never acted as if they had been annulled. The "Directory" was commended as worthy to be more strictly observed. The "Form of Church Government" was there in the constitution of the restored Church. It is well known that the Catechisms were not discarded; the Shorter Catechism obtaining a quite important place in the life of the Church. The Catechisms, it may be supposed, have not been removed from being Subordinate Standards of the Church up to the present, unless one has to conclude that the Union Assembly of 1929 left them out. It is to be noticed that in the Form for the Ordination of Ministers they are not now mentioned.

We have now to consider the interesting question as to how far and to what extent the Westminster Documents were English Puritanism acting upon the Church of Scotland. It will be impossible here to go into this question at length. One may only mention that whatever part

they may have taken, or whatever influence they have had, in the faith, worship and government of the Church of Scotland, it cannot be credited wholly to English Puritanism. We may recall what has already been said respecting the large part taken in the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly by the Scottish Commissioners. The Documents received not a little of the impress of the Church of Scotland through these its representatives. It would be of great interest to take up each Document in turn and consider what effect it may have had upon the Scottish Church. At present, however, we can only take into consideration *The Directory for Public Worship*. It scarcely needs to be remarked that this was manifestly a "Directory," that is, an authoritative guide to Public Worship. Like the *Book of Common Order* it was not designed to be a Prayer-Book containing forms of services which had to be followed rigidly in every particular. It had even more the character of a "Directory" than had the *Book of Common Order*. Its directions are much fuller than what are given in the older book. The prayers it provides are clearly meant as models, and not for reading as they stand in the book. Yet it would seem that some users of the book did read them.

Some have alleged that the *Directory* ousted, as they consider it, the superior *Book of Common Order*. It may at once be asked whether the former is inferior to the latter. The two books have a great family likeness, although here and there each may gain over the other. It can hardly be denied that the *Directory*, except in certain details, perpetuates much the same form of Public Worship as had been made customary by the original *Book of Common Order*. The Scottish Commissioners had a large part in its compilation, and the hand of Henderson seems plain in at least one item. Considering the share taken in its drawing up by the men from Scotland who knew the *Book of Common Order*, one may well regard it in principle, even if not definitely so, a revision of the earlier book.

There is the further question as to whether the *Directory* can be said to have ousted the *Book of Common Order*. David Laing states: "But the use of the Book of Common Order, so far as the liturgical part was concerned, had fallen into desuetude long before the time of the Westminster Assembly." That is probably going too far. Yet there is a little support for it. Balconquhal, writing in 1639, asserted that before King James left Scotland in 1603 "there was no set or public form of prayer used in Scotland, but preachers or readers, and ignorant schoolmasters, prayed in church, sometimes so ignorantly as it was a shame to all religion to have the majesty of God so barbarously spoken unto." Incidentally, this may be some little evidence against the assertion, sometimes made, that the *Directory* and Cromwell's Army were the cause of irreverence and uncouthness in Public Worship in Scotland.

It will not be advisable to give too much weight to Balconquhal's testimony. He was strongly on the side of those who were opposed to the Reformed Church of Scotland. But as his father had been a parish minister, so he would be likely to know something about the matter. If his statement is no more than twenty-five per cent. believable, it furnishes some evidence. The bibliography of the *Book of Common Order*, however, shows that in certain places editions of it continued to be printed, along with the Psalms, up to the middle of the 17th century. But the later editions were by no means the original book. The Editor of the Bibliography points out: "A comparison of the contents of the different editions, as noted in the Bibliography, reveals the somewhat remarkable fact, that these contents vary considerably, both in regard to matter included, and the order and arrangement of the several items." And he goes on to say that, although the book had at first been put forth under the authorisation of the General Assembly, the various changes appear to have been made without any such authorisation. His view is that the 1564 edition does not seem to have been regarded by the printers as a standard to which they must conform. Indeed, they made alterations and additions without ever being called in question. This evidence will invalidate Leishman's statement: "Hitherto the text of the Book of Common Order had been jealously guarded from alteration." The conclusion we may come to is that the book had ceased to have an official position in the Church which was no wonder considering the violent changes to which the Church had been subjected. But it continued to have some little use in one or other of its various editions right up to the introduction of the *Directory*, but probably mainly in certain parts of the country. In a letter from London, dated May 1644, Samuel Rutherford refers to it: "We offered this day to the [Westminster] Assembly a part of a directory for worship, to shoulder out the service book." There he, one of the Scottish Commissioners, associates himself with the production of the *Directory*, and seems to contemplate, perhaps with satisfaction, the shouldering out of the old book. Something more suitable for the times had been produced. Of course there would be some few who were attached to the old service-book. It deserved to be highly valued. But the fact that Alexander Henderson could propose with acceptance in the General Assembly the preparation of a new book shows that the old one had now lost its position in the Church. It will be a mistake of the imagination to picture to one's self the Church of Scotland as having in use right up to 1645 a much-loved service-book which everybody was familiar with and depended upon for the exercises of Public Worship, and that then another book of quite a different kind was brought in and was foolishly allowed to displace the former one. Such was not the case with the *Book of Common Order* and the *Directory*

respectively. It is not to be thought with respect to the introduction of the *Directory* that it was in the least the same in Scotland as in England. In the Church of England it was meant to displace the hitherto rigidly enforced *Book of Common Prayer*, and to inaugurate a very different style of service.

To conclude with regard to the *Directory* one may briefly refer to some of its merits. It introduces the excellent practice of opening Public Worship with a solemn call to worship God. It gives simple directions for seemly behaviour in church. It breathes throughout a true spirit of reverence, and its aim is to draw ministers and congregations to an engaging in not merely formal and possibly mechanical exercises of worship, but into guided heartfelt devotions. When it first came out it was highly thought of both in England and in Scotland. Baillie expresses his hearty approval of it. We may well believe that if its directions had been more carefully followed some of the slovenliness observable at times in the conduct of worship would have been avoided, and the general character of Public Worship would have been improved. One ventures to say so much without approving of every single feature of it. We may think also that unobtrusively and without being generally acknowledged it has effected gracious results. When considering these two books, the *Book of Common Order* and the *Directory*, we do well to value both highly for the benefits they brought to the Church in times past, and for the good help by way of suggestion and guidance they may give us in the present.

It was not only through the Westminster Documents that English Puritanism may be thought of as affecting the Church and general religious life of Scotland at this time. It could do so by influencing the religious life of those Scots who came in touch with it in England. The London in which the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly sojourned had its own rich Puritan piety. It is advisable to know something of the character of this, for many in forming their opinions of English Puritanism have been too much deceived by its bitter enemies and by the skits and detractive statements of clever and unscrupulous defamers and caricaturists, of which kind there were not a few in the licentious Restoration period. We may rely much more on descriptions like the following furnished by Drysdale. He says: "At this time [when the Civil War was breaking out] the famous religious service, known as 'The Morning Exercise,' was begun [in London] by Mr. Case [an active minister], and circulated from church to church, to meet the rising spiritual needs of the community. . . . The final Wednesday of every month was a day of humiliation in the city, the well-known 'Monthly Fast.' . . . We need not say how the Sabbath [commonly called by the Puritans 'The Lord's Day'] was observed and regulated.

There was a profound cessation of worldly business. The cries of the street vendors were hushed. . . . [On other days] the baser public spectacles and buffooneries were prohibited, as, if not in themselves sinful, for the present, inexpedient. . . . They [the Puritans] had their own shortcomings, and much they did lent itself easily to a burlesque like *Hudibras*. . . . But caricature is not serious history. . . . For lofty religious aims and ideals, for patriotic self-denial and public spirit, for pulpit power and eloquence, for literary activity, for the prevalence and encouragement of sacred learning, and for the manifestation of great moral energy, we may fearlessly point to the days of old Presbyterian London.”¹

The Scots ministers who stayed in London as deputies of their Church felt and recognised the earnest religious atmosphere which they found there. When Baillie was first in London as one of the Commissioners to arrange the treaty with Charles, before London was free from the tyranny of Charles and Laud, he writes : “ The godly here in great numbers meet oft in private houses, for in public, they dare not ; fast and pray and hear gracious sermons . . . truly these humble and hearty prayers are our greatest confidence.” Later in 1645, when attending the Westminster Assembly, he writes : “ The constant practice here on the least appearance of any danger is to flee both to public and private fasting. Truly the godly here are a praying people, and the Parliament is very ready to further this disposition.”² Again, in 1646, he communicates the opinion : “ This is the incomparably best people I ever knew, if they were in the hands of any governors of tolerable parts.”³ George Gillespie was similarly impressed. He wrote in 1645 : “ If I myself were a free man, I would rather choose London than any place I know, for my own edification, and have abundance of precious occasions.”⁴ Gillespie was spoken of as perhaps affected a little with English sectarianism. It was quite a mistake. There was no more convinced Presbyterian than he. But this opinion about him shows that he had been touched by the religious enthusiasm of various kinds which he found represented in London. So we may think of those Scottish members of the Westminster Assembly, Baillie, Henderson, Gillespie, Rutherford, and Johnston, exercising in London the considerable influence which their abilities and opportunities afforded them. They wrote books and issued tracts, all with telling effect. But the influence was not all on one side. They would go back to Scotland stimulated by their experiences of London Puritanism, and would convey a little of the warm piety of the South to increase the fervour of the piety of the North.

¹ *History of the Presbyterians in England*, 307, 308.

² *Letters*, Vol. II, 305.

³ *Ibid.*, 413.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 507.

We may also take into account the influence upon the religious life of Scotland by books and pamphlets emanating from the South. It was an age of pamphlets. When in London the Scottish ministers produced books and pamphlets to express their views, and doubtless these had a great effect. On the other hand, it is likely that some English Puritan publications would reach Scotland. During the time of the Westminster Assembly, in 1645, a book was published in London which afterwards became most notable in Scotland. This was *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, written by a Puritan. Several editions were quickly issued, and it is highly probable that a number of copies found their way to Scotland, which were eagerly read and produced a profound impression. That Rutherford read the book (perhaps in London) may be gathered from an observation in one of his letters. In 1650 *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, a little treatise by David Dickson of Irvine, and in part by James Durham, was published. It was one of the chief books to nourish the religious life of Scotland for several generations. It would be interesting to know whether it owed any of its inspiration to the *Marrow* which had appeared five years earlier. It presents the same Federal Theology, though of course that is set forth in the Confession of Faith. It lays the same stress on faith in Christ, and gives similar modifying touches to the rigour of the Calvinistic theology, and it also emphasises the performance of good works by the Christian. Another work, *The Christian's Great Interst*, written by William Guthrie and published in 1657, likewise shows a warm evangelical teaching modifying its Calvinism. We notice in a good part of it the rudiments of a dialogue. Did Guthrie's small treatise owe anything to impressions from reading the *Marrow*? The *Marrow* was in dialogue form. In 1650 was published Baxter's *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and much later (1678 and 1679) the wonderful *Pilgrim's Progress* by John Bunyan. One can hardly doubt that these and other English Puritan books had readers in Scotland or that they made some impression upon ministers and people of the Church.

V

As another distinct phase of interaction between the Scottish Reformed Church and English Puritanism we have to consider the conditions brought about in Scotland when it was under Cromwell's government and had his army placed as garrisons in various parts of the country. Then the Scottish Church and people came into close contact with a particular type of the Puritanism of the Southern Kingdom. It was somewhat different from what representatives of Scotland had chiefly had to do with hitherto. Formerly their contact had been mainly with

civilian church-folk and ministers ; now it was with Government officials and predominantly with soldiers. Formerly it had been with Presbyterian Puritans ; now it was for the most part with Independents, and with members of a variety of strange and sometimes fantastical or fanatical sects, which are not rightly to be designated Puritan.

It is in this phase of interaction that those writers who assert that English Puritanism worked serious injury and loss upon the worship and ways of the Church of Scotland profess to find the chief sources of baneful influence. Their assertions are often somewhat vague and indiscriminate. It is always necessary to take the trouble to distinguish between the real Puritans and the Sectaries, between sound and orthodox Puritans, and those belonging to the fantastic and unorthodox sects, who are not rightly called Puritans. It may even be an advantage at times to distinguish between Elizabethan and Commonwealth Puritans. At any rate, one must not put all in the same class, Milton and Muggleton ; John Owen, the learned and saintly Independent, sometime Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and the abnormal George Fox ; the learned members of the Westminster Assembly and the illiterate associates of the sects of the Familists and the Seekers ; the large mass of sober, intelligent, and earnest Puritan Churchmen and the comparatively few but noisy antinomian agitators. As to Cromwell's army in Scotland there are those who think of it as full of pernicious sectaries who were bound to work evil upon the Church and people. Perhaps they have accepted Baillie's outlook too fully, and even gone beyond him. Baillie had a great dread of the Sectaries and their influence, and he included among them the Independents. At first he had some approbation for the religious character of the Independents with whom he met, but gradually he became bitter against them. It is not altogether to be wondered at. Their representatives had been a continual obstructive body in the Westminster Assembly. When they obtained more power in conjunction with Cromwell, they had hindered the orderly settlement of the English Church according to a Reformed and Presbyterian plan. They were destroying the splendid projects for the covenanted uniformity of religion for Scotland and England which the Scottish Church leaders had so much set their hearts upon accomplishing. To such as Baillie their ecclesiastical ideas seemed utterly perverse and foolish. Moreover they, with Cromwell, so it seemed to Baillie and others, stood for the toleration of all, or almost all, religious parties and sects, even some of the most unorthodox and disruptive. Baillie and his fellows could not tolerate such toleration. We have, however, to be very wary of accepting too readily Baillie's point of view. We have moved on since his day and have reached other view-points, What might be excusable in him may not be excusable in us.

Let us just glance at the possible religious effects of Cromwell's Army

in Scotland. There is little likelihood that the army was able to exert any influence at all upon the affairs and modes of worship of the Church of Scotland, and only little upon the religious customs of the people. It has to be remembered that it was an invading army, and naturally the people were unfriendly towards it and all it might stand for. The Church was prepared to resist any encroachments of the Government or the Army so far as it could, and the people were ready to support the Church authorities. Any of Cromwell's preachers who were brought to Scotland effected nothing. It was the case that a good many of the soldiers were given to preaching. The preachers were often officers who took the place of army chaplains of whom at first there were few. Their preaching was chiefly confined to the soldiers. Soldiers also preached, some of them rather rantingly. At times there were even cases of them invading the pulpits of the churches. But the notion that the army was composed of preachers, and all of them of the ranting kind, who went about disseminating strange doctrines, is probably far from correct. Those soldiers who dared to express extreme views, or what might be contrary to the fundamental orthodox beliefs, or anything irreligious and atheistic, were restrained and sometimes punished. There was no liking for Quakers in the Army, and, if they had not left previously owing to their anti-militarist principles, in time they were all expelled. The Anabaptists were not regarded with favour and were barely tolerated. Three-quarters of the Army followed the way of the Independents. Says Firth: "A sober Congregationalism became the dominant form of religion." It was indeed the case that a few Quaker Meetings were started as a result of the efforts of Quaker soldiers who were or had been in the army. They were unable, however, to gain much ground in Scotland, then holding the Bible in highest esteem, because of their depreciation of the authority of the Scriptures and their exalting that of the 'Inner Light.' There were also some Baptist and Independent congregations formed. All these were largely made up of soldiers and their dependents. When the army was withdrawn from Scotland they could hardly continue, and in course of time they dwindled away. Outwardly upon the Church and religious life of the people the effects of the Cromwellian Government and Army in Scotland was inappreciable.

But we may well suppose that the Army did leave some religious effects upon the religious life of the people in Scotland, even though not outwardly visible. There can be no doubt that there was much real religion amongst the soldiers. They impressed outsiders by their good behaviour wherever they went. In Scotland they were a great contrast to the wild Irish troops who so recently had been let loose upon the people. They came provided with their special religious booklets, *Cromwell's*

Soldiers' Catechism and *The Soldiers' Pocket Bible*.¹ Neal quotes Bishop Burnet as giving this testimony that "there was an order and discipline among the English, and a face of gravity and piety that amazed all people. Most of them were Independents and Baptists, but all gifted men, and preached as they were moved, but never above once disturbed the public worship."² It is quite possible that the preaching of the soldier put into the minds of Scottish folk the notion that laymen may preach as well as ministers. With this view not many will now quarrel. The place of the preaching of the laity has now become recognised in almost every Communion. The prevailing religious fervour in Cromwell's Army, even if some of it was not genuine and some of it strange, could scarcely fail to stir up a similar fervour among the people of the country. Religious enthusiasm is infectious. But that of these soldiers would hardly move the Scots towards Independency. It would be more likely to work in the way of making them more in earnest about their own religious concerns, and particularly to uphold the Covenants. There was that in it which could have a bracing effect upon the people to prepare them to meet the evil days which were then not very far ahead for all the faithful of the land.

VI

After the Restoration there could be little interaction between the Reformed churchfolk of Scotland and the Puritans of England. They were all overwhelmed in a common disaster. Perhaps reports of the sufferings of the faithful in each country would stir up all to bear bravely whatever affliction or persecution came upon them. On St. Bartholomew's Day, the 24th August, 1662, about 2000 ministers of the Church of England, rather than renounce their principles and act contrary to their convictions, under the Act of Uniformity suffered being driven from their homes and livings, which for most of them meant going out into homelessness and poverty. Perhaps that great example of renunciation encouraged ministers in Scotland to remain equally steadfast to their principles in the testing time which was already upon them. At least as large a proportion of them endured being forced out into the "wilderness."

At the Revolution the Reformed Church Party in Scotland and the Puritans in England were able to render mutual assistance. The position of either might not have turned out so favourable as it did had it not been for the support which each was able to afford the other when King William was struggling to arrange matters in Church and State.

With this we will conclude our survey of the interaction between the Reformed Church of Scotland and the English Puritans. It has indeed been only a survey. The subject is worthy of a much fuller and more intensive treatment.

¹ Firth : *Cromwell's Army*, 331, 332.

² *History of the Puritans*, IV, 54, 55.

